

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

# UNIVERSAL LIFE CHURCH MONASTERY STOREHOUSE,

NO. C19-0301RSL

**Plaintiff,**

V.

MAURICE KING, *et al.*,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO STRIKE AS MOOT**

### Defendants.

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion to strike two documents AMM filed during discovery motion practice, namely (a) AMM's request for leave to respond to plaintiff's motion to strike portions of a declaration and (b) an objection AMM raised to the timeliness of plaintiff's sur-reply. Dkt. # 101. The motion is DENIED as moot.

The Court denied plaintiff's motion to strike paragraph 6 of the King Declaration without need for further briefing on the issue. *See* Dkt. # 128 at 3 n.2. Thus, neither AMM's request for leave to respond nor plaintiff's motion to strike that request address issues currently before the Court. With regards to AMM's objections to plaintiff's sur-reply, those objections were implicitly overruled when the sur-reply was considered. *See* Dkt. # 127 at 2 n 2. A separate motion seeking the same relief is redundant. In addition, there is no basis for striking an

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO STRIKE AS MOOT - 1**

1 objection merely because the opposing party thinks it lacks merit.

2

3 Dated this 17th day of July, 2020.

4 Robert S. Lasnik

5 Robert S. Lasnik  
6 United States District Judge

27 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
28 MOTION TO STRIKE AS MOOT - 2